



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL SURVEYS

THOMAS J. RILEY
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

I. APPROACHES TO THE SOCIAL SURVEY

The social survey is the social technologist's attempt to see things in perspective. It is his appreciation of the organic character of social facts. It is as yet his nearest approach to a doctrine of social forces. The purpose of this paper is to consider some of these surveys, especially to consider to what extent they have taken account and to what extent the method can take account of the social forces, to which the sociologists give the fundamental place in social theory. The general spirit of the paper is rather to ask questions than to close arguments.

Through the charity organization movement.—To appreciate the social survey one must consider how it came to be. I shall not, however, attempt to give a history, but rather an essential account of it. When we recall who have planned and conducted these community invoices, consider their scope, the relative emphasis of subjects, and their immediate results, it is at once apparent that they are closely related to the charity organization movement.

The charity organization movement is in one sense organized, co-operative effort in some selected districts. A charity organization society lists all the agencies for social betterment in a given district, takes account of the needs of the neighborhood, and deliberately begins a persistent fight for better things. It brings together the charity agent, the friendly visitor, the truant officer, the probation officer, the settlement worker, the teacher, the preacher, the physician, and the citizen; focuses their minds now on this case and now on that condition; and then sends them out as united workers with a plan. This is done not once and not twice but all the time. If the city is properly organized by districts, it is possible through this plan to know conditions

and to work according to a well-defined program. It was inevitable that those who united to solve now this problem and then that one, coming from different fields and using different methods, should soon discover that there were common elements in many of the questions they considered from time to time. Who, therefore, more than the thinker in the work of organized charity should require a general survey of the social problems of the community?

The social survey is wider and deeper than this. The associated charities is an organization of the forms and factors of social service; the survey examines living, working, and community conditions, takes account of the home, the shop, and the neighborhood. The charity organization is an appreciation of the organic character of *forms of social service*; the social survey is an appreciation of the organic character of *social problems*. Although the survey is broad and deep it is not long. The influence of it may abide, but soon its pictures are old, and its figures out of date. It has a definite beginning and a definite close as a survey. This is one of the problems involved to which I shall recur near the close of the paper.

There is another way in which the charity organization societies created the demand for the social survey. Through the "case-counting" method of determining the causes of poverty, used so generally by these societies, it became clearer and clearer that these causes ran in series or even in circles instead of standing isolated. Sickness was frequently set down as the cause of distress in a case, but what caused the sickness? It may have been the conditions at the shop or the conditions at the home. It may have been the habits of the person involved. It may have been these separately, but often it was all combined. Or again, we may ask why do people have bad habits? Often it is because of bad homes that are bad because of bad shops. Or, it may be, people have bad homes because of bad habits, because of bad work, i.e., low wages, long hours, unhealthful or dangerous occupations. And so the series runs, or the round goes on. The discovery of the serial or circular character of the causes of

poverty created a demand for a competent investigation of these problems in their interrelations.

Another evidence of the close connection of the charity organization movement and the social survey is the fact that one of the most significant outcomes of probably the greatest social survey that has yet been made was an associated charities, born out of the needs that the survey disclosed, and commissioned to carry forward the work that the survey outlined.

Through scientific method.—There is another approach to the social survey. This is by way of the scientific method. However else we may characterize the scientific method it is the method of objectified material. The instruments of science are laboratories, test tubes, weights, and measures. In social technology this same objectivation of material can be seen. Scarcely more than a dozen years ago the charitable workers of the country were still classifying the causes of poverty under the heads of misconduct and misfortune. Today they are charging distress almost entirely to general social and living conditions. To illustrate this one might cite the classification by Dr. Frankel, viz., ignorance and industrial inefficiency (both chargeable to the failure of education), the exploitation of labor, and the lack of governmental supervision of the welfare of citizens; while Miss Brandt would leave out the first two, ignorance and inefficiency, regarding them as the results of the other two, but would add a personal cause, the perverted will.

The scientific method may also be described as inductive. It is an allegiance to induction that has given us the more competent methods of social investigation, of which the social survey is the comprehensive type. Although "case-counting" is strictly inductive it is not scientifically valid. The cases that are counted are not representative for the general population, or even for the industrial class. They may be representative of dependents, but even in the case of these, the personal equation is so manifest that only the tyro in science could regard his "counts" as more than shrewd guesses. Against this "form" of scientific method applied to an element of the population not of general significance, the reaction was inevitable.

Moreover, there are limitations to personal observation by the individual investigator. It has been aptly said that: "Life is too short, prejudices too ineradicable, individual qualifications too specialized, and the personal equation too disturbing, to permit any single individual, however gifted, to see for himself the community as a whole, and to measure the influences and forces that shape the family destiny."¹ Thus arose a demand for comprehensive investigations of great classes of the population by scientifically valid methods, that brought forth a grist of studies of the standard of living; or for a general examination of living and working conditions in significant districts that brought forth the social survey. The social survey is an attempt to determine what standards of living do and may exist in a district, or to apply an approved standard to the industrial population of a community in order to disclose the heights and depths of living, and to set the problems of raising weakened life to higher powers.

Through sociology.—Although the social survey is primarily the work of the social technologist it does not appear to what extent the social theorist may have been responsible for the point of view and for the ordering of effort and of material. It is not unlikely, however, that the insistence of the sociologist upon the interrelation of problems, that the claims of sociology as a synthesis of the special social sciences, and that the efforts of sociologists to answer the question what is worth while, have at least played the part of nurse, if they have not been the father of the thought.

These things, then, may probably be set down as antecedents of the social survey: (a) the charity organization movement—the organized effort of social service, necessarily disclosing the organic character of social problems themselves; (b) the scientific method—dealing inductively with objectified material and demanding representativeness and the elimination of the personal equation; and (c) the insistence of sociology upon the organic character of social facts.

¹Dr. E. T. Devine, Publications of the American Sociological Society (1908), 85.

II. SOME SOCIAL SURVEYS

Some beginnings.—It would be difficult to list the social surveys that have been made, not so much because of their number, as because of their variety. Indeed, without some definition of the social survey one would hardly know what to include in the list. However, we shall not offer a definition, but will call attention to certain investigations that have some elements in common which perhaps entitle them to the name social survey.

A few years ago there appeared in one of the leading magazines of America a series of articles on the cultural interests of great cities, including among others London, Paris, New York, and Chicago. In one sense these were social surveys. They were somewhat short on data and not fundamentally inclusive, but they had the survey spirit.

I had the pleasure of preparing a monograph on what I was pleased to call the Higher Life of Chicago, which in form and spirit, though certainly not in significance, might have some claim to the title we are considering. It set in order of composition, at least, the several classes of facts found in the greater surveys about to be mentioned.

The city plan is a form of survey; though we may hardly call it a social survey. It is, however, the ground plan for all the various social undertakings of a community nature. In one very true sense also a competent charities directory—as the London, New York, and Boston directories—is a social survey. It is usually more formal than vital, but after all it is a fairly complete and well arranged inventory of the agencies of community betterment. But I must come at once to the great surveys.

“The Life and Labor of the People of London,” Charles Booth.—I should like to call attention first to the monumental work of Charles Booth, *The Life and Labor of the People of London*, published in seventeen volumes, after seventeen years of investigation. Mr. Booth writes of his work, “My object has been to attempt to show the numerical relation which poverty, misery, and depravity bear to regular earnings and comparative comfort, and to describe the general conditions under which each class lives” (I, 6). Or again he says that he has tried to describe

"life and industry as they exist in London at the end of the nineteenth century, under the influences of education, religion, and administration" (XVII, 220). Accordingly we find four volumes on poverty, five on education, and seven on religious influences.

"The Pittsburgh Survey," Paul U. Kellogg and collaborators.—In the United States the Pittsburgh Survey stands out pre-eminent. The survey is so recent—not all the volumes having yet been published—and so stupendous that one may easily mistake it at many points. I shall have recourse therefore to the words of the director of the survey in describing it. Mr. Kellogg has called it "a rapid close-range investigation of living conditions in the Pennsylvania steel district." Or, again, he says, "Our inquiries have dealt with the wage-earners of Pittsburgh (*a*) in their relation to the community as a whole and (*b*) in their relation to industry. Under the former we have studied the genesis and racial makeup of the population, the physical setting and its social institutions; and under the latter we have studied the general labor situation: hours, wages, and labor control in the steel industry; child labor, industrial education, women in industry, the cost of living, and industrial accidents."²

In brief, the Pittsburgh Survey deals with (*a*) the people—for the most part the immigrant, (*b*) the place—clean air, clean water, and pure food, (*c*) the work—homes, wages, factory inspection, accidents, cost of living, and (*d*) the culture—libraries, schools, playgrounds, and children's institutions.

"The Buffalo Survey," Mr. John Daniels, in its demonstration year amounted to a study of the Poles as a considerable factor in the population of the city. The work has been permanently organized and much is expected from the survey in perpetuity so well begun. We might pause long enough to mention that some other cities, as Boston with its "1915 movement" and Kansas City with its Board of Public Welfare, are doing social surveying in a legitimate sense of the word, while St. Louis and Chicago and some others are at least talking about it.

² *Charities and the Commons*, June 2, 1909.

III. SOCIAL SURVEYS AND THE SOCIAL FORCES

Interests.—I have tried to describe but not to discuss the surveys of the life and labor of the people of London and of the people, the place and the work of Pittsburgh. I desire now to reconsider these social surveys especially from the standpoint of what the sociologists call social forces. It may at first seem that this is not a legitimate procedure because the surveys deal with material conditions and not with social forces. There is a measure of plausibility in such an objection. But it is not our purpose to require the surveyor to speak in the jargon of the sociologist or to think in terms of social forces. We shall not think it amiss if he speaks in terms of wages instead of appetitive desire. We shall encourage him to think in terms of industrial accidents instead of protective or negative ontogenetic forces.

I should like to say at the outset that it has been a most delightful experience to find how close is the correspondence between the social technologist's topics in his survey and the social theorist's terms in his list of social forces. There is, as should be expected, a constant difference between them; the one speaking in terms of forces, and the other in terms of the results of these forces, a difference that should not be hard to translate.

Before pointing out this correspondence it is necessary to adopt for the purposes of comparison, some statement of the social forces. My assumption at this point is that the phenomena of society are the phenomena of social forces. I assume also that the social forces are desires. It is my understanding that sociologists are practically agreed upon these two assumptions. How shall we classify these desires, these social forces?

Professor Ward has classified them as follows (*Pure Sociology*, 261) :

Physical Forces (function, bodily)	{	Ontogenetic	{	Positive, attractive (seeking pleasure)
		Forces		Negative, protective (avoiding pain)
	{	Phylogenetic	{	Direct, sexual
		Forces		Indirect, consanguineal

Spiritual Forces (function, psychic)	} Sociogenetic Forces	{ Moral (seeking the safe and good) Aesthetic (seeking the beautiful) Intellectual (seeking the useful and true)
---	--------------------------	--

Professor Small adopts the familiar sixfold classification of human desires, saying "that all the acts which human beings have ever been known to perform have been for the sake of (*a*) health, (*b*) wealth, (*c*) sociability, (*d*) knowledge, (*e*) beauty, (*f*) rightness, or for the sake of some combination of ends which may be distributed among these six" (*General Sociology*, 444).

Professor Ross adopts another classification of desires, hence of social forces. He classifies them as natural and cultural, and lists them as follows:

Natural Desires	{	<i>a</i>) Appetitive: Hunger, thirst, and sex-appetite. <i>b</i>) Hedonic: Fear, aversion to pain, love of warmth, ease, and sensuous pleasure. <i>c</i>) Egotic: These are demands of the self rather than of the organism. They include shame, vanity, pride, envy, love of liberty, of power, and of glory. The type of this class is ambition. <i>d</i>) Affective: Desires that terminate upon others: sympathy, sociability, love, hate, spite, jealousy, anger, revenge. <i>e</i>) Recreative: Play impulses, love of self-expression.
Cultural Desires	{	<i>f</i>) Religious: Yearning for those states of swimming or unconditioned consciousness represented by the religious ecstasy. <i>g</i>) Ethical: Love of fair play, sense of justice. <i>h</i>) Aesthetic: Desire for the pleasures of perception, i.e., for enjoyment of "the beautiful." <i>i</i>) Intellectual: Curiosity, love of knowing, or learning, and of imparting.³

However competent the schematic classification by Professor Ward may be philosophically, it does not lend itself readily to the uses of the surveyor be he never so philosophical or scientific.

A little familiarity with the greater social surveys that have already been briefly described makes it perfectly clear that the

³ *Foundations of Sociology*, 169.

list of Professor Small corresponds quite clearly to the scope and order of subjects in the surveys. This obvious fact may be because the list was consciously or unconsciously used, or because both the theorist and the technologist arrived at the same classification giving it a high degree of probable adequacy for working purposes.

What has just been said is not necessarily an acceptance of the sixfold list as a competent classification of human *desires*, using that word to name the subjective side of *interest*. It is declaring the fact of a close correspondence and practical agreement between the list of Professor Small and the subjects in the surveys. What has been said leaves one free to adopt any other classification of *desires* as contrasted with *interests*, using the latter term as Professor Ross does when he says, "Desires may well be distinguishable from interests, the former being the primary forces as they well up in consciousness, the latter the great complexes, woven of multicolored strands of desire which shape society and make history."⁴

Professor Ross himself offers a fourfold classification of *interests*, i.e., of "complexes of goods which serve as means to the satisfaction of a variety of wants," which differs from Professor Small's list chiefly in having four instead of six classes. I have been surprised at the close correspondence between the classifications of Professor Small and Professor Ross on the one hand, and of Mr. Booth and Mr. Kellogg and their collaborators on the other. Note the correspondence in the case of Professor Ross and Mr. Booth; the former listing wealth, knowledge, religion, and government; the latter using life and industry, education, religion, and administration. Except for practical limitations the agreement in the case of Professor Small and Mr. Kellogg might have been equally apparent. These limitations, however, only obscured, they did not destroy the classification.

It has already been noted that the *Pittsburgh Survey* included a study of the problems of clean air, clean water, and pure food, including a special study of the prevalence of typhoid, and also

⁴ *Foundations of Sociology*, 168.

of industrial accidents. Nothing could more happily illustrate the recognition of the health interest as Professor Small calls it. Or, to consider the wealth interest for a moment, at every point in the survey the question of wealth and its distribution is present or presupposed. Indeed, Dr. Devine has declared in the presence of some here now that one of the most striking things discovered by the *Pittsburgh Survey* was

the contrast between the prosperity on the one hand of the most prosperous of all the communities of our western civilization, with its vast natural resources, the generous fostering of government, the human energy, the technical development, the gigantic tonnage of the mines and mills, the enormous capital of which the bank balances afford an indication, and, on the other hand, the neglect of life, of health, of physical vigor, even of the industrial inefficiency of the individual. Certainly no community before in America or Europe has ever had such a surplus, and never before has a great community applied what it had so meagerly to the rational purposes of human life.

The wealth and sociability interests are inseparably bound up with the fundamental subjects of the survey such as low wages for men, lower wages for women, overwork for all, and the destruction of family life by the demands of such days' work and by the accidents of industry. Under this head should be mentioned also the problem of the immigrant and the work of charity.

The knowledge interest is reported under schools and libraries, while the beauty interest has recognition under such subjects as art galleries. The rightness interest was taken into account under the moral influence of playgrounds, the system of aldermanic courts, and the work of the churches.

There is every internal evidence for believing that some such a classification was used in ordering the survey and that the directors recognized the organic character of the problems involved.

Desires.—Thus far I have been considering the social surveys from the standpoint of *interests*, using that term to denote complexes of the objective aspects of desire. I wish now to reconsider them from the standpoint of desire, that is from the subjective aspect of interest, as Professor Small uses the term.

For this purpose I shall use Professor Ross's classification of desires. I have already given the list and shall now take it up *seriatim*, noting its recognition in the surveys under discussion. First must be mentioned, therefore, the *appetitive desire*, that is hunger, thirst, and sex desire. With these *as such* neither of the surveys deals except perhaps with the thirst for drink. But at the same time they deal much with the questions of wealth, wages and labor—complexes of the *ends* of the appetitive desire; the desire appearing as a sort of veiled force.

The hedonic desire, that is fear, aversion to pain, love of warmth, ease, and sensuous pleasure, is for the most part not taken into the account by the surveyors, possibly because it is so nearly submerged under the more immediate desires of appetite just referred to. *The egotic desire*, that is shame, vanity, pride, envy, love of liberty, of power, and of glory, and ambition did not seem to impress the surveyors much, possibly because it is deadened by the manner of life, save in the case of vanity, envy, and the love of liberty and of power. Much the same can be said of the *affective* and the *recreative desires*. Some of these natural desires, as Professor Ross calls them, have a veiled recognition through a fairly adequate account of their objects of satisfaction.

When we consider the cultural desires, it is not altogether clear to what extent they were reckoned with. The *religious* desire, as a yearning for "states of swimming consciousness," the *ethical* desire as a love of fair play, a sense of justice, seem to have been consciously present at many points in the surveys, especially in that of Mr. Booth. The *aesthetic* desire, as a desire for the pleasures of the beautiful, and the *intellectual* desire as a love of knowing, of learning, and of imparting, likewise has a place, though a somewhat uncertain one, in these social invoices.

A little care is necessary in passing judgment as to the desire lying behind some specified act, for all too often the mischief and even the crime of men are due not to an evil desire but to a worthy one denied its legitimate expression. It is apt, though it may be trite, to name the recreative desire as an illus-

tration, which, when denied its natural gratification, is likely to express itself in petty offenses among youths, or in more vicious practices among men. So that when one is considering drunkenness, immorality, and crime, one may be dealing with the objective aspect of the natural recreative desire gone wrong.

But it may seem I have pronounced on the recognition of desires in the surveys without having given any evidence in support of the findings. I shall therefore call attention to some of the evidence upon which I have based my judgment.

Mr. Booth seems to have appreciated the value of such spiritual things as desire and at the same time the difficulty of reducing these values to terms of traditional standards. He declares that "in intensity of feeling . . . and not in statistics lies the power to move the world." At times he writes as if he had the hedonic and the recreative desires clearly in mind. For example, he says, concerning the inside "filling up" of many blocks in London, that in some places may still be seen small rough-roofed erections, interspersed with little glass houses, that "represent hobbies, pursuits of leisure hours—plants, flowers, pigeons—and there is room to sit out, when the weather is fine enough, with friend and pipe" (I, 31).

At another time he writes as if he were discussing the egotic desire. He says: "Connected with this—the ebb and flow of this or that industry, or all the industries together for a time—is the saddest form of poverty, the gradual impoverishment of respectability, silently sinking into want" (I, 151). He is thinking not of wealth or of want but of that psychical somewhat that he calls "respectability silently sinking into want." At another time he points out the subjective and objective difference between a man who is on the up grade and another who is on the down grade even though they both are at the same level, assuming that each knows the direction he is going. Such a keen analysis makes the psychic fact of the condition of a man's mind a force to be reckoned with. He calls attention vividly to another psychic fact and indicates the necessity of reckoning with it in a program of meliorism. He says:

With regard to the disadvantages under which the poor labor, and the evils of poverty, there is a great sense of helplessness; the wage earners are helpless to regulate their work and cannot obtain a fair equivalent for the labor they are willing to give; the manufacturer or dealer can only work within the limits of competition; the rich are helpless to relieve want without stimulating its sources. To relieve this helplessness a better statement of the problems involved is the first step [p. 67].

Furthermore, in his chapter on "The Point of View," Mr. Booth (II, chap. VII) describes three elements of it that are readily translatable into the ordinary lingo of the social psychologist. They are (1) the relation to past experience, (2) the relation to expectation, and (3) the degree of sensitiveness of the public mind.

Other internal evidence of the virtual recognition of desires as social forces could be cited from *The Life and Labor of the People of London*, but we will content ourselves with these few. Turning now to the *Pittsburgh Survey*, I am compelled to say that, in the short time I have had to consider the partial reports that have come to hand, I have not found evidences of an appreciation of desires as social forces so plentiful as in the London survey. I believe, however, that a careful reading would find many evidences of this appreciation. In the quotation I am about to make there is an implicit recognition of several classes of social forces some of which the survey can and some of which it cannot take account of. Mr. Kellogg says:

The War Department engineers can tell you the exact number of cubic feet which slide past either side of the Point every minute. The sanitarians can give you the number of bacteria, friendly or plague-begetting, which infect a cubic centimeter. The weather man in a high building can forecast the exact stage which the water will register hours hence. But what of the people? . . . They have largely taken themselves for granted. They have rarely taken time to test their own needs or consciously gauge the destination of the currents that possess them. They are here . . . the strong, the weak, the cowed, the ambitious, the well-equipped and the pitiful. They jostle and work and breed. For the most part they run a splendid course. But they do not keep tally, and their ignorance means sorrow and death and misunderstanding.⁵

⁵ *Charities and the Commons*, XXI, 526.

IV. SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL SURVEYING

Social surveys and social psychology.—In conclusion I wish to set a few problems about social surveying in the light of what has already been said. I shall not attempt to discuss the questions asked, leaving them for the most part with little more than the asking. The first problem to which I invite your attention may be pointed by the question: Is it possible to take an account of the social interests of a community in terms of general living and working conditions and to work out a program of betterment from such an inventory, if the fundamental proposition of the sociologist is true, viz., that the social forces are the desires of men, or that the vital principle of society is psychical force? To take but a single illustration, does not the thesis of the sociologist demand a psychological account of poverty rather than a statement of wages and a description of housing conditions? This question may be stated in a slightly different form on the practical side thus: Can the desires of men be controlled through the objects that satisfy them?

Social surveys and their eugenic factors.—Closely related to this general question is another one: Is there not some danger of overlooking the factor of heredity, and especially the principles of eugenics, in the prominence given to the environmental factor? Under the spell of objectivication is there not danger that personal and parental responsibility may be undervalued? This may be another way of saying that we are in danger of undervaluing the power of religion in our wonderful progress of understanding and controlling social conditions. It is not altogether evident that we should look to the sociologist to rediscover the personal power of religion, but he may well have a care as may the social technologist that this powerful and general force may not be valued too lightly.

Social surveys and social statics.—Another problem that comes to mind is: Can the social survey, which is essentially static, be made to function through a long period of time. A good survey is an accurate picture, but it is not a motion picture. Mr. Booth says:

I have attempted to produce an instantaneous picture, fixing the facts on my negative as they appear at a given moment, and the imagination of my readers must add the movement, the constant changes, the whirl and turmoil of life.⁶

After his seventeen years of work Mr. Booth depends not upon the cross-sectional view of social conditions, but upon the memory of his workers and the flow of the seventeen years, to give length to his survey. Mr. Kellogg says:

The modern industrial city is a flow, not a tank. The important thing is not the capacity of a town but the volume and currents of its life and by gauging these we can gauge the community. We must gauge at the intake—the children, the immigrant, the countrymen who come in; gauge at the outlets; and gauge at the stages in the course of the working life. If there be unnecessary death, if strong freed hands are crippled or diseased through their manner of living or working, if the twelve-hour man sees everything gray before his eyes in the morning, if women work in new ways that cost their strength or the strength of their young; if school children are drafted off as laborers before they are fit; if boys grow into manhood without training for the trades of this generation—then we have a problem in social hydraulics to deal with.⁷

Of course, it is perfectly evident that if the surveys are significant they are certain to carry themselves forward not as surveys perhaps, but in the form of undertakings that got their inspiration and their basis of fact out of the survey. In this sense they are functional. Might it not be possible for them to carry themselves forward in adequate systems of social accounting, whereby we should not need again to take the invoice, but a balance sheet?

Social surveys as purposeful.—It may be pertinently asked also whether the social survey dominated by a practical purpose can be completely scientific. Perhaps we should not put upon the survey the test of scientific validity. It may be that they are for immediate and practical purposes and reach their sufficient proportions when they amount to convincing arguments to persuade men to undertake the work of civic and social betterment. The question would still remain, however, whether the collection and interpretation of data can be done without prejudice when

⁶Booth, *op. cit.*, I, 26.

⁷Kellogg, *op. cit.*, 525.

there is an ever-present purpose, and when every item is to be tested by the touchstone of getting something done.

Allow me a word of summary and then I am through. I have tried (1) to indicate the approaches to the social survey, naming the charity organization movement, the scientific method, and the insistence of sociology; (2) to describe the London and the Pittsburgh surveys; (3) to raise some questions as to the limitations of the method of the surveys. I wish to add my heartiest approval of this latest form of organizing the available knowledge of general living and working conditions, and its necessary outcome, a program of industrial and social betterment, the measure of the power of which no one can yet take. To use the figure of the distinguished president of the American Political Science Association in his splendid address at the opening meeting of these kindred societies, the social survey issuing in action is the best illustration I can think of, of the scholar and the statesman coming together in united effort.

DISCUSSION

MAURICE PARMELEE, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

I have been asked to discuss Professor Riley's paper from the following point of view: "What do the facts and conditions of crime and the principles of criminology indicate should be included in a social survey of a great city?"

I find it a little difficult to discuss this paper from this point of view because Professor Riley has not furnished us in his paper an outline of a social survey of a great city. If he had done so I could have indicated just where attention should be paid to the investigation of crime. But without such an outline it is impossible to indicate briefly the scope of such an investigation, for many of the things which would be done anyway in such a general social survey would also be necessary for a thorough investigation of crime. For example, the subject of population is of great importance for the investigation of crime, as, for example, its density, composition, etc. But it goes without saying that the population would be studied anyway in a general social survey of a great city, so that the information thus gained would be at hand to use in the investigation of crime.

It is a well-known fact that the majority of crimes are committed in cities, so that the city is the best place in which to investigate crime. Such a thoroughgoing investigation of crime included in the social survey of a

great city ought therefore to be of the greatest value. For one thing it ought to throw light upon this very significant fact that crime is concentrated in the cities. Furthermore, it ought to throw a great deal of light upon the general question of the causation of crime.

The first question of importance for the social surveyor is, of course, how he is to go about investigating the crime in a great city. It is natural to expect that the records of the criminal courts would furnish a great deal of valuable information, but unfortunately under present conditions the courts fail to record a great deal of very valuable information which cannot be secured in any other fashion. These records will of course indicate the number of persons tried, the number convicted, and for what crimes. But they furnish very little information as to the character and past life of these individuals. For example, some years ago while making a study of the effect of immigration upon crime in New York City, I tried to determine the classification of those convicted of crime according to race. After going through the court records for a good many years I was forced to desist from the attempt because of the inadequacy of these records. In like fashion the police records would give the number of arrests but would fail to furnish a great many other important facts which should be included in them. However, from the personal knowledge of many of those connected with the courts and the police administration a good deal of this information can be secured.

To speak of but a few of the things which should be included within the scope of such an investigation, the administration of the criminal courts and of the police should be carefully studied; the influence of the saloons or of other drinking-places upon crime; the opportunities and incentives for gambling and high living as well as the ways in which making a living is difficult in a great city. As many individual cases as possible should be studied in order to trace in these specific concrete cases the causation of crime. It would be well to choose the cases in such a fashion that they will illustrate as far as possible all the different kinds of crimes and of criminals. And while of course the social or environmental causes of crime will be thoroughly studied in such a survey, the hereditary forces also should not be neglected, but as far as possible the anthropological characteristics of these criminals should be studied in order to be able to estimate to some extent the biological forces which are at work in the causation of crime.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Professor Riley has discussed in his paper a very timely topic, the relation of sociology to social surveys. The sociologist is, of course, vitally interested in the scientific survey or investigation of the social conditions in various communities. This work, if properly done, should be not simply of some practical value to the community concerned, but should be signifi-

cant for the development of a science of sociology, which is after all nothing but the study of the biological and psychological factors in the social life. I suspect, however, that some of the social surveys undertaken in this country fall far short of the requirements of scientific sociology. Most of them, to be sure, have undertaken a more or less adequate study of the biological factors in the community life, such as population, place, work, and the like. The conditions of the environment and the conditions affecting nutrition and physical well-being have received attention, but relatively less attention has been given to the psychological factors in the community life, such as education, religion, government, and law, to say nothing of more intangible phenomena like public opinion, the mental attitude of individuals toward their group, and the ways in which they are co-ordinated. Professor Riley's monograph on *The Higher Life of Chicago* comes as near being a social survey approaching the matter from the psychical standpoint as some recent social surveys do in approaching the matter from the material side.

But why should the psychological aspects of the community life be so emphasized? Is not their study quite unnecessary from a scientific point of view? Do we not know everything about a community when we know the material conditions of its life? The answer will be evident if we consider for a moment what sociology is. A society is certainly a group of people living together. I think that we can all agree upon that. But how do they live together? By co-ordinating their activities or by co-operation, as we say, but this does not tell us much. How do they co-operate, or co-ordinate their activities? Manifestly by means of mental interactions, that is, through interstimulation and response. A society is, therefore, a group of people living together by means of interstimulation and response. What its total life is depends very largely upon the attitude of its members toward one another. How they co-operate depends, therefore, upon common will, belief, and opinion, and the agencies by which common will, belief, and opinion effect social control. These agencies are chiefly religion, government and law, and education. These are the chief agencies by which a community controls its common activities and carries on a collective life process. We should not forget, however, that back of them stand the more intangible things already mentioned. We need, therefore, in any scientific social survey a study not only of the material conditions of life, such as work, wages, population, housing, etc., but also a study of religion, government and law, education, and the more intangible things of common will, common belief, common opinion, and the like. Only such a survey can be adequate from the sociological point of view, or from any purely scientific point of view.

My criticism of some social surveys in the United States, then, is that they fail to take account sufficiently of these psychological factors. They do not go to work in any intelligent way to study these factors. Of course, the study of these factors is more difficult than the study of the material factors,

and I have not time to discuss with you scientific methods by which the study of these factors may be undertaken. But it is evident that these factors are not impossible of scientific study and that they are the real key to the social situation in every community. If more stress were laid upon them, if ways were found out of influencing mind, the dynamic agent in society, I think the complaint of Professor Blackmar regarding the inefficacy of most social reform movements would not need to be made.

I need hardly say that I disagree with Professor Riley's assumption that the desires are the true social forces. Surely Dr. Riley is aware that for at least a dozen years a considerable number of sociologists have protested against this idea. By social forces we can mean, of course, nothing more than the active factors present in any social situation. The word desire is altogether too vague to cover the subjective or psychological factors in the social life. No two sociologists could agree upon the exact connotation which they give to the word. Some use the word desires to mean the native impulses; others mean by it the feelings, and still others, general habits of response of a population. The truth is, this word desire was borrowed by the sociologists, not from the psychologists, but from the economists, who made use of the term in connection with that over-rationalized conception, "the economic man." Desire is a term borrowed from the intellectualistic social philosophy of the early nineteenth century. It is vague in its psychological connotation and altogether inadequate to describe the varied psychological factors in human society. How much, may I ask you, of the phenomena which Professor Vincent has so admirably described for us in his paper on "Group Rivalry" could be interpreted in terms of conscious desire? We must bring the terminology of sociology into accord with the terminology of scientific psychology; and only thus can we take into account and adequately study the various psychological factors in the social life, whether we are making a concrete social survey or giving an abstract statement of theory.